

## 'TRAFFIC LIGHTS REPORT' 2016 MONTENEGRO

### Monitoring report against the EU Guidelines for the EU 2016 Progress Report

#### Note:

Following report contains information about the situation and consequent progress along the indicators of the Results Framework of the 'Guidelines for EU support to civil society in enlargement countries, 2014-2020' (EU Guidelines). The Results Framework encompasses elements that look for the progress in areas related to: legal and policy framework for existence, functioning and sustainability of the CSOs; CSOs involvement in decision making processes; and organisational development of the CSOs.

In addition to the representatives of the EU, elements of the Results Framework and its monitoring system have been developed since 2013 throughout 55 different regional and national events encompassing approximately 900 CSOs and 120 government representatives (Offices for cooperation with CSOs, Ministries for EU integration and other relevant resource ministries and agencies) from the countries of the Western Balkan and Turkey.

#### Main features of the monitoring system include:

- Unified approach in methodology in all countries of the region.
- Regional comparison and track of national progress.
- Majority of indicators are composite that are broadly defined assessing quality; therefore, for the monitoring purposes following had to be taken into consideration: existence of particular legal and policy frameworks, practice in implementation of the legislation, and perception of quality of the legislation and its consequent implementation of those who are affected by the legislation.
- Some indicators specifically call for measuring of perception.
- For majority of indicators there is no data available from reliable sources of information in the region; therefore, to acquire objective understanding of particular phenomenon, the perception was taken into account, where the perception of CSOs about the sector vs. perception of CSOs of their individual organisation and practice was assessed. In some cases, this was also complemented by the perception of general population about the same phenomenon.
- All of the information that are needed to assess the situation in a country are synthesized in this report. More elaborative data can be obtained from the accompanying country needs assessment report developed by TACSO and its Resource Centres, as well as from the narrative reports from the surveys.
- Sound and reliable research methodology and innovative and participatory approaches.

#### Methodology:

##### Information collection

- Information collected for this report, therefore for TACSO needs assessment reports, comes from following sources:
  - Desk study - review of legislation collection of information from some of the public institution, review of other related and relevant documents and reports (mainly for the part related to the legal and policy framework and cooperation between CSOs and governments).
  - In-depth interviews with representatives of relevant institution (10 different institutions) for information validation (mainly for the part related to the legal and policy framework and cooperation between CSOs and governments).
  - CSO survey - Sample universe is mainly unknown due to the lack of accurate data in majority of the countries, sample size is 180-250 per country, type of sample is convenience quota sample, where quotas are defined by region and main area of activity with the aim to maximise the dispersion. The most relevant CSOs are included. Data collection is based on combined method - F2F, CAWI, CATI. (Information from the survey is used throughout all indicators of the report, and is the main source of information for the indicators related to the organisational capacities of the CSOs.)
  - General population survey (GP survey) - sample universe is population of the country 18+, sample size of at least 1000 respondents per country. Type of sample - stratified random sample, representative for country population. Data collection in all countries F2F except in Albania, Macedonia and Turkey (CATI). Post-stratification was done by gender, age and education. (Findings from this survey were used for some indicators and for the correlation.)

##### Measuring change

- In order to quantify composite and all indicators, index has been developed. Results Framework consists of 6 broad objectives that are divided into 23 indicators:

For the purpose of index formation, indicators were operationalized by items and each of them is in fact operationalized benchmark from the EU Guidelines. At the end, 138 of items were analyzed. All of the steps related to calculation of indexes are incorporated into the macro document that can be easily used for the next years of monitoring, i.e. there is no need to go through the development of the metrics (mathematics for recalculation) beyond this stage. Simple entering of information and data can be recalculated in the macro document for the next year. Precise methodology for index calculation can be obtained from TACSO.

- It is important to mention that apart from obtaining information from the experts or TACSO Resource Centers, CSO survey and GP survey on the situation in the civil society sector in the country, one more measure was obtained – measure of importance of each of the items. In each country, various experts from the civil society sector have been evaluating the importance each of the items on the scale from 0 to 100.
- Unique measure of importance for each item, per country, was obtained by calculating average importance of all provided values from evaluators. Importance of these items significantly differs between the countries, which mean that each country received different weight for each of the items. Therefore, same answers on certain items in different countries may lead to different overall score for certain indicator, which finally can result in different colors in indexes. This aspect enabled preservation of national specificities and priorities identified by those concerned.
- Recalculated answers on the items were multiplied with average importance given for that item in the respective country.
- After that, all items belonging to one indicator were summed up in order to obtain one measure per indicator/sub-objective. This score was categorized to five categories:
  - 15% – green, the best evaluated in the region
  - 15% – light green, the second best evaluated in the region
  - 40% – yellow, middle positioned in the region
  - 15% – orange, the second worst evaluated in the region
  - 15% – red, the worst evaluated in the region

	ALB	BIH	KOS	MAC	MNE	SRB	TUR
1. An enabling legal and policy environment, for the exercise of the rights of freedom of expression, assembly and association	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Light Green	Yellow
2. An enabling financial environment, which supports sustainability of CSOs	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange
3. Civil society and public institutions work in partnership through dialogue and cooperation	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	Yellow
4. Capable, transparent and accountable CSOs	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Light Green	Yellow	Orange
5. Effective CSOs	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow
6. Financially sustainable CSOs	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Orange	Red

These thresholds are provisional and can be adjusted based on the preferences of the EU. In general, all indexes will be cross-checked in September because in some countries there will be updated information available for 2015 (notably Turkey).

	Alb	BiH	Kos	Mac	Mne	Ser	Tur
1.1.a. Quality of existing legislation and policy framework	Green						
1.1.b. Progress with the adoption and implementation of relevant legislation	Green						
1.2.a. Number of employees in CSO (permanent and part-time)	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow
1.2.b. Number of volunteers in CSOs	Yellow						
1.2.c. Quality of legislative framework	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow
1.3.a. Quality of the enabling environment for grass-roots organisations and/or civic initiatives	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow
2.1.a. CSOs' perception of the ease and effectiveness of financial rules and reporting requirements	Yellow						
2.1.b. Quality of financial rules (with the focus on built-in mechanisms)	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Green
2.2.a. Quality and applicability/practice of the legal framework for individual and corporate giving	Yellow						
2.3.a. Quality of the system of tax benefits for the CSOs' operational and economic activities	Red						
2.4.a. Increase of public funding for CSOs	Yellow						
2.4.b. Quality of state funding frameworks for civil society organisations (focusing on procedural document)	Yellow						
3.1.a. Percentage of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively consulted with CSOs	Yellow						
3.1.b. Quality of structures and mechanisms in place for dialogue and cooperation between CSOs and public institutions	Yellow						
4.1.a. Percentage of CSOs publishing their governance structure and internal documents	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
4.2.a. External perception of importance and impact of CSOs activities.	Yellow						
4.3.a. Percentage of CSOs making their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
4.4.a. Share of CSOs that monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators	Green	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Green	Green
5.1.a. Share of CSOs which have developed strategic plans including human resources development activities	Yellow						
5.2.a. Number of CSOs who use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving advocacy goals	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
5.3.a. Share of CSOs taking part in local, national, regional and international networks	Yellow						
6.1.a. Percentage of CSOs that confirm that they are able to raise funds according to their strategic plans	Yellow						
6.2.a. Diversity in CSO sources of income	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red

### 1.1.a. Quality of existing legislation and policy framework

*Freedom of speech is explicitly guaranteed in legislation; all individuals and legal entities can express themselves freely, assemble peacefully and establish, join and participate in formal and non-formal organizations.*

*Legislation requires only prior notification (and not authorization) for exercising freedom of assembly.*

*Maximum number of days needed for registration of CSOs is 10.*

*The registration costs are maximum (in capital city) 30 Euros.*

*In terms of legislative standards:*

- 1. There is a legal framework according to which any person can establish associations, foundations and other types of non-profit, non-governmental entities (e.g., non-profit company) for any purpose.*
- 2. The legal framework allows both individual and legal persons to exercise this right without discrimination (age, nationality, legal capacity, gender etc.).*
- 3. The legal framework provides guarantees against state interference in internal matters of associations, foundations and other types of non-profit entities.*
- 4. The legal framework is based on international standards and provides the right for freedom of assembly for all without any discrimination.*
- 5. The laws recognize and do not restrict spontaneous, simultaneous and counter-assemblies.*
- 6. The legal framework provides freedom of expression for all.*
- 7. Restrictions, such as limitation of hate speech, imposed by legislation are clearly prescribed and in line with international law and standards.*

*29% of surveyed CSOs are negative about the legal regulation which regulate work of CSOs, and 66% of them are positive.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 1.1.a are:**

*-We have no specific recommendations for this area.*

### 1.1.b. Progress with the adoption and implementation of relevant legislation

*There are gaps in legislation and policy framework regarding CSO.*

*Legislation and policy framework regarding CSO are moderately implemented. When it comes to basic freedoms, such as freedom of association, expression, assembly, legislation is mainly implemented. However, that is not the case when it comes to public funding which is being implemented according to the procedures that are not in line with the current Law on NGO. In addition, not all of the provisions concerning CSOs participation in decision-making are being fully implemented.*

*There is no change in gaps in legislation and policy framework regarding CSO.*

*There are the same number of gaps in implementation of legislation and policy framework regarding CSO as last year.*

*Practice standards:*

- 1. Every individual or legal entity in practice cannot form associations, foundations or other non-profit, non-governmental organizations offline or online. The problem here is that an online process of forming associations is not possible.*

2. *The examples of state interference of the state in internal matters of associations, foundations and other types of non-profit entities are not known, nevertheless, it is still hard to say if there are or there are not such cases of the state interference.*
3. *There are cases of encroachment of the freedom of assembly, and not every group of people can assemble at desired place and time, in line with the legal provisions. That is especially visible on the example of LGBT group and lack of possibility to organize LGBT parades.*
4. *Restrictions are justified with explanation of the reason for each restriction, which is promptly communicated in writing to the organizer to guarantee the possibility of appeal. Restrictions are justified, but the question is legitimacy and reliability of those explanations.*
5. *Simultaneous, spontaneous and counter-assemblies can take place, and the state facilitates and protects groups to exercise their right against people who aim to prevent or disrupt the assembly.*
6. *No excessive use of force is exercised by law enforcement bodies, including pre-emptive detentions of organizers and participants. However, the Government is somewhat selective in applying the rules on assembly. Although in general there are no issues in this area, there has been a case of political protests last year that left many answers to be obtained.*
7. *CSO representatives, especially those from human rights and watch dog organizations do have the right to freedom of expression on matters they support and they are critical of. Formally, there are no restrictions that would prevent them from expressing their opinions, but they sometimes face consequences for their expressed attitudes.*
8. *There are cases of encroachment of the right to freedom of expression for all. Some CSOs have appealed the Media Council for Self-Regulation for the lack of publishing their demanti and reactions to different information placed in public.*
9. *There are cases where individuals, including CSO representatives would be persecuted for critical speech, in public or private.*

*22% of surveyed CSOs believe that the circumstances for development of CSOs have worsen in comparison to the last year, where 24% of them believe that circumstances have improved.*

*50% of surveyed citizens in Montenegro find freedom of press good, and 42% bad.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 1.1.b are**

*-Provide conditions in which CSOs representatives who critique the governing structures will not be faced with consequences.*

**1.2.a. Number of employees in CSO (permanent and part time)**

*There are neither accurate data on the number of permanent nor part-time employees in CSO.*

*The data on the number of employees in CSO are not available on the annual level (permanent, part-time, both type of employees).*

*The situation on availability of the data on the number of employees in CSO is not better now than it was a year ago.*

*There is no data available to track percentage of all employed is employed in CSO sector.*

*54% of surveyed CSOs stated that they have full-time employees, and 46% of them stated that they have part-time employees. On average, surveyed CSOs have 3.1 employees.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 1.2.a are**

*-Establish an effective system of keeping records on employees in civil society sector.*

**1.2.b. Number of volunteers in CSOs**

*There are neither accurate data on the number of volunteers in CSO, nor the number of volunteers in CSO are not available on the annual level. Therefore, neither total number of volunteers in CSO in 2015 is not known, nor it is possible to estimate change in the number of volunteers in CSO in terms of an increase, decrease, or no change in comparison with the last year.*

*There are neither accurate data on the number of voluntary hours implemented in CSO, nor the number of voluntary hours implemented in CSO are not available on the annual level. Therefore, total number of voluntary hours implement in CSO in 2015 is not known.*

*24% of surveyed CSOs believe that CSOs in their countries engage volunteers, 72% of those surveyed stated that they have engaged volunteers during 2015, and average volunteering working hours per week is 13.5. 55% of surveyed CSOs stated that they have engaged the same number of volunteers during 2015 as during 2014, 22% engaged more than 2014, and 21% less than in 2014.*

*General population have stated that 6% of them have been engaged in volunteering during 2015, on average of 10 weeks, and 16.9 hours of volunteering work per week.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 1.2.b are**

*-Establish an effective system of keeping records on number of volunteers. This should be regulated by the Law on Volunteering that needs to be created.*

**1.2.c. Quality of legislative framework related to employment in CSOs and volunteers**

*There are no discriminative articles for CSOs in labour legislation (including active employment policy). Same rules are applied to CSOs as to other employees. CSOs participate in programs available to other employees.*

*Legislative framework is not simulative towards promotion of volunteering. Currently, the Law on Volunteer Work regulates this area and it prescribes complicated procedures for engaging volunteers, prohibits volunteering for those younger than 15 years, thus preventing students to participate in school actions as volunteers. It rather formalizes, instead of promoting volunteering as basic way of community action. The Law on Volunteering is not adopted although it has been planned and included in strategic documents.*

*Legislation prescribes reimbursement of travel expenses, but it does not say anything about the taxes.*

*Legislation enables compensation for volunteers` expenses, but it does not state anything about taxes.*

*23% of surveyed CSOs find the legal solutions stimulating for volunteering, and 67% of them find legal solution not stimulating.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 1.2.c are**

*-Adopt the Law on Volunteering. The Law should encourage the promotion of the volunteerism and also establish the mechanisms for running statistics on the number of volunteers.*

**1.3.a. Quality of the enabling environment for grass roots organisations and/or civic initiatives**

*Registration of grass-roots is not mandatory. Grass-roots organizations as such are not tackled by the Law.*

*Unregistered organizations can freely operate.*

*Unregistered organizations cannot receive financial support. They cannot participate in public funding, but they are free to obtain funds from individuals, donors, corporations, etc.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 1.3.a are**

Grass roots organizations as such are an important part of the civil society and their impossibility to participate in public funding may be problematic in terms of their financial sustainability. Currently we have no concrete propositions regarding this matter.

### 2.1.a. CSOs' perception of the ease and effectiveness of financial rules and reporting requirements (disaggregated by type / size of CSO)

*Financial (including tax) rules are moderately reasonable for implementation.*

*Financial (including tax) rules are moderately clear.*

*Financial (including tax) rules are not proportionate to CSO turn-over. Same rules apply to all of the CSOs.*

*There is a moderate support system when it comes to implementation of financial (including tax) rules.*

*Support system provides clear instructions regarding implementation of financial (including tax) rules.*

*Financial public officers within support system are somewhat knowledgeable. However, there are differences across the regions. Officers working in the capital city and other bigger and more developed cities are usually more knowledgeable, while that is not the case in smaller towns.*

*Out of surveyed CSOs 85% are positive about how clear and understandable, 81% are positive how simple to implement, and 85% are positive how reasonable are prescribed financial rules, obligation of bookkeeping and accounting that refer to their organisation.*

*19% of surveyed CSOs completely agree and 46% mainly agree that there is efficient support system within the institutions CSOs are obliged to report to. 15% of surveyed CSOs completely agree and 52% mainly agree that support system within these institutions provide clear instructions regarding implementation of financial (including tax) rules. 12% completely agree and 46% mainly agree that these institutions are providing support services in standardised manner with competent and knowledgeable staff on the matter in hand.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 2.1.a are**

*-Adapt financial rules according to the CSOs turn-over. Financial rules should be different for smaller and bigger NGOs with larger turn-over.*

### 2.1.b. Quality of financial rules (with the focus on built-in mechanisms that financial rules and obligations change as the turn-over and non-commercial activities change).

*There are neither different formats (different forms of reporting) according to CSOs' turn-over, nor there are different formats for reporting. There was no a change in number of different formats of reporting in comparison to one year ago.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 2.1.b are**

*- Adapt financial rules according to the CSOs turn-over*

### 2.2.a. Quality and applicability/practice of the legal framework for individual and corporate giving

*Legislation does provide stimulating tax incentives for corporate giving. Although there are certain tax incentives, it is still not favourable given the fact it concerns giving in a limited scope of areas.*

*There is a tax relief in the amount of 3.5 % of taxable income for corporations.*

*Legislation does provide tax incentives for individual giving. Although there are certain tax incentives, it is still not favourable given the fact it concerns giving in a limited scope of areas.*

*There is a tax relief in the amount of 3,5 % of taxable income for individual persons.*

*There is no a % of tax allocation for public benefit purposes.*

*Data on the number of registered individual taxpayers who donated to CSOs is not available at all, so it is not available on the annual level too.*

*Data on the number of registered corporate taxpayers who donated to CSOs is not available at all, so it is not available on the annual level too.*

*There is neither data on percentage of corporations' taxpayers nor individual taxpayers donated to CSOs during the previous year.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 2.2.a are**

*-Widen the scope of areas that fall under the areas that are subject to tax incentives.*

*-Establish the mechanism for effective statistics on those that perform corporate giving.*

**2.3.a. Quality of the system of tax benefits for the CSOs' operational and economic activities**

*Income from CSOs mission-related economic activity is not tax free.*

*CSOs can perform economic activities if they are stated in the Statute and registered in the Register of Economic Associations. If the income of economy activity exceeds 4000 EUR in the given year, then the CSO cannot perform economic activity until the end of that year. It may continue to perform economic activity in case that it does not exceed 20% of the total income for the previous year.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 2.3.a are**

*-Increase the limit for the economic activity of CSOs. The way it is regulated now represents big obstacle for all those who by performing economic activity function as social enterprises.*

**2.4.a. Increase of public funding for CSOs**

*Data on the amount of public funding of CSOs is available, so the data on the amount of public funding of CSOs is available on the annual level tool.*

*There is an increase in public funding of CSOs in comparison to one year ago?*

- *Public funding of CSOs increased in comparison to one year ago for 0.08%. However, it is still very low amount, in adequate for the capacities of civil society sector and not sufficient to provide for stronger social impact of CSO projects.*

*25% of surveyed CSOs believe that there has been decrease of the public funding to their organisation in comparison to one year ago., while 48% of CSOs believe that there has been no change.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 2.4.a are**

*-Determine the minimum percentage of the budget that would be allocated for public funding of CSO projects, as to provide for sustainability. Provide greater amount of public funding in order to create conditions for stronger impact of CSOs projects.*

**2.4.b. Quality of state funding frameworks for civil society organisations (focusing on procedural document)**

*Legal framework for public funding includes total of 3 positive statements out of following 8 statements:*

1. *Public funding is not decided on the basis of policy papers Public funding is most often decided based on project proposals. However, public funding is often done besides established procedures as public call for project proposals. That is mostly practice on local level, where there are large amount of funds being allocated based on Decision of the Mayor.*
2. *There is no inclusion of beneficiaries in programing of the tenders.*
3. *Clear criteria is published in advance. Although officially there are published criteria, sometimes they are not clear enough. In addition, some ways of allocation (mostly from local level) are being done besides the criteria.*
4. *There are deadlines for decision. However, they are not always respected.*
5. *There are no merit decision with arguments.*
6. *There is no evaluation of achieved outputs and outcomes on the project and program level. Process of monitoring and evaluation is one of the greater drawbacks of the current public funding system. Apart from the formal process, there are no assessment of the impact of the activities.*
7. *There is no possibility of prepayments.*
8. *There is possibility of multi-annual contract. It is regulated by the Law, but it is not the common practice to have multi-annual contracts.*

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 2.4.b are**

*-Adopt the Changes of the Law on NGOs that will regulate new system of public funding including the amount, procedures, criteria and evaluation mechanisms.*

**3.1.a. Percentage of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively\* consulted with CSOs**

*Data on the draft laws/bylaws consulted with CSOs in accordance to national legislation is not available, so the data is not available on the annual level.*

*When it comes to consultations with CSOs regarding draft laws/bylaws/strategies and policy reforms:*

1. *There is an adequate access to information (there is a legal obligation to publish draft laws on the Internet and drafts are regularly published).*
2. *There is sufficient time to comment (sufficient time to comment: minimum 15 working days).*
3. *There is selection and representativeness / diversity of working groups (criteria for appointment of the representatives are transparent, open, inclusive and known in advance).*
4. *There is an acknowledgement of input, but on a very low level.*
5. *it is not known to which degree to input are taken into account.*
6. *There is a feedback / publication of consultation results (there is an obligation to publish a feedback report with a summary of consultation process, list of involved stakeholders, summary of received comments/proposals, their impact on the draft law and justification of rejected comments/proposals). Legislation prescribes regular publishing reports on conducted consultations, public debates, submitted comments, etc. However, this is rarely done in practice.*

*There is no data available on % of laws/bylaws, strategies and policy reforms effectively consulted with CSOs. Montenegrin legislation prescribes specific ways of consultations with CSOs. It is defined that CSOs are consulted prior to the draft of the document has been made, in the initial phase of the process. This is not practice and it is done very rarely. On the other hand, CSOs do participate in public debates intended to the consultations of the wider public after the draft of the document has been made. Acknowledgment of inputs given by CSOs in the working groups is on a very low level and they most often do not get feedbacks from consultations, meetings, etc.*

*18% of surveyed CSOs are not familiar with the state institutions, and 47% of the CSOs are familiar with such structures and mechanisms but they believe that structures and mechanisms have no use.*

Out of surveyed CSOs, 4% of them have participated in IPA programming, 6-7% of them have stated that they have participated in development of bylaws and policy documents, 16% have participated in development of national action plans, 17% in development of specific laws, 19% in national strategies, 22% in local strategies, 24% in local action plans.

6% of CSOs who participated in consultation process find that all of their inputs during consultation process have been considered, 30% find that most of their comments have been taken into consideration, and 46% believe that the comments were somewhat taken into consideration.

13% of surveyed CSOs who participated in consultation process stated that public administration provided detailed enough feedback, and consultancy results were easily available to all parties; 62% of surveyed CSOs who participated find that there was some feedback, and some consultancy results were published by the public administration bodies.

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 3.1.a are**

- Provide environment for more substantial the acknowledgment of CSO inputs in shaping public policies
- Regularly publish reports from consultations and feedback to CSOs suggestions.

**3.1.b Quality\* of structures and mechanisms in place for dialogue and cooperation between CSOs and public institutions**

Quality of structures and mechanisms in place for dialogue and cooperation between CSOs and public institutions in terms of:

1. CSO representation in general is good.
2. Representation of smaller/weaker CSOs is poor.
3. Its visibility and availability is good.
4. CSOs perception of structures and mechanisms is poor

There is a designated body, institution or contact point for dialogue between the Government and CSOs. That body is Council for Development of NGOs. It is functional since July 2014 in its current composition. However, it faces challenges in achieving better impact to civil society development.

There is no designated body, institution or contact point for dialogue between Parliament and CSOs.

81% % of ministries has such a body, institution or contact points with continuous and constructive cooperation.

73% % of local governments has such a body, institution or contact points with continuous and constructive cooperation.

However, often changes in the contact points prevent the establishment of continuity of this position. There are no clear and systematic description of job duties of contact points and they do not have pro-active role in the wider sense of initiating cooperation, developing common activities, etc.

Data on designated bodies, institutions or contact points is available in the transparent and accessible manner.

Mechanisms for dialogue are moderately clear.

Mechanisms for dialogue are moderately open.

Mechanisms for dialogue are moderately accessible.

Mechanisms for dialogue are not efficient (issues are not resolved in timely manner).

They are not efficient in a substantial level. Their impact is limited and does not have enough of the power to make more significant effect to the state of environment for civil society development.

54% of surveyed CSOs find that the quality of mechanisms for cooperation between CSOs and government are good, and 38% of CSO find them to be bad. 64% of CSOs believe that representation of CSOs in structures and mechanisms

is good, and 27% believe that representation is bad, 53% believe that representation of smaller CSOs is bad, 56% of CSOs believe that availability and visibility of the structures is good.

When it comes to mechanisms for dialogue 67% of surveyed CSOs find them clear, and 26% of CSOs find them not clear, 60% find them open, and 34% find them not opened. 60% of CSOs find mechanisms accessible, and 33% do not agree with it, and 44% of CSOs find mechanisms efficient, whereas 49% find them inefficient.

**Suggestions for further improvements under the indicator 3.1.b are**

-Strengthen the capacities of structures for dialogue and cooperation. Provide space for their stronger impact.

**4.1.a. Percentage of CSOs publishing their governance structure and internal documents (statutes, codes of conduct etc.)**

83% of surveyed CSOs believe that decision making in CSOs is in compliance with the prescribed laws and rules of the organisation, and 97% of surveyed CSOs claimed that decision making in their organisation is in compliance with the prescribed laws and rules of the organisation.

45% of of surveyed CSOs believe that decision in CSOs are made by key individuals and top management, and 38% believe that decision in CSOs are made by the top management in consultations with employees. Whereas 32% of surveyed CSOs claimed that decision in their organisations are made by the key individuals and top management making, and 42% claimed that decisions are by the top management in consultations with employees.

83% of CSOs claim that they publish their statute, 70% claim that publish their rulebook, 76% claim that they publish their annual activity report. Whereas, surveyed CSO claim that they believe that only 36% of the sector publishes their annual activity report.

**4.2.a. External perception of importance and impact of CSOs activities.**

CSO in MNE are moderately trustworthy (49% of CSO believe that people find them trustworthy, whereas 45% of general population find CSOs trustworthy).

Self-perception of the CSOs is that 6% of surveyed CSOs believe that people completely trust to CSOs in MNE; 44% believe that people mainly trust to CSOs, 40% believe that people mainly do not trust to people, and 6% believe that people do not trust to CSOs at all.

10% of surveyed CSOs believe that CSOs are too often present in public, 45% believe that they are just right present in public, 43% believe that CSOs are not present enough in public, while 2% did not say anything.

45% of citizens trust in civil society organisations, and 52% of citizens have perception that the CSOs are committed to solve the problems.

7% of citizens believe that they are very well informed about the activities of the CSOs in their countries, 36% are somewhat well informed, 34% somewhat not informed, and 23% not informed at all.

85% of citizens use media as a main source of information about CSOs and their activities, and 36% use social media.

3% of citizens believe that cooperation between CSOs and government is very good, 26% believe it is mainly good, 37% believe it is mainly bad and 14% that it is very bad.

**4.3.a. Percentage of CSOs making their (audited) financial accounts and annual reports publicly available**

81% of CSOs said they make their financial reports available to the public, and 71% of them stated that the make their financial statements that are audited also available to the public.

Nevertheless, CSOs believe that only 36% of all organisations make their financial reports publicly available, and only 31% of the organisation make audited financial statements available to the public.

#### 4.4.a. Share of CSOs that monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators

67% evaluate their programs as to learn lessons for the next cycle and to assess the quality, while the rest of 33% does the pro forma evaluation.

78% of CSOs stated that they have an established system for assessment of efficiency of implementation of projects. 64% of CSOs use internal evaluation when evaluating their projects. 67% of surveyed CSOs stated that they have established efficient system for assessment of efficiency of implementation of their strategic plans. 16% of CSOs use external and 73% use internal evaluation when evaluating efficiency of implementation of their strategic plans.

#### 5.1.a. Share of CSOs which have developed strategic plans including human resources development activities

46% has human resources plan. 67% of surveyed CSOs stated that they have a strategic plan.

67% of CSOs claimed that they have established system for staff performance appraisal. 10% of CSOs claimed that they do the staff performance appraisal externally, and 75% of them do it internally.

#### 5.2.a. Number of CSOs' who use adequate argumentation and analysis for achieving advocacy goals

Out of surveyed CSOs who are active in the area of public advocacy 13% stated that they use it always, 28% use often, 29% sometimes, 20% rarely, and 11% never use analyses and/or research results for their advocacy activities.

#### 5.3.a. Share of CSOs taking part in local, national, regional and international networks

Data on CSO networks active in Montenegro is not available. However, practice and experience has showed that not many organizations are members of regional and international networks. Situation is somewhat better at the national level.

There are 4 active CSO networks in MNE.

#### 6.1.a. Percentage of CSOs that confirm that they are able to raise funds according to their strategic plans

60% of organisations claim that they stick to the strategic plan when fundraising for their organisations, while 23% of them stated that they mainly stick to the organisation's mission. Nevertheless, they believe that only 32% of CSOs stick to the organisation's strategic plan when fundraising for their organisation, 29% stick to the organisation mission, and 40% of CSOs believe that CSOs mainly adapt to the donors' priority. 44% of those that have strategic plan, acquire funds in accordance with it.

#### 6.2.a. Diversity in CSO sources of income

On average, CSOs in Montenegro have 2.4 sources of financing per CSO. The largest part is funded from public funding (42% national and 41% local level).



*Technical Assistance for  
Civil Society Organisation*



*This project is funded  
by the European Union.*